

Opinion 2390 (Case 3658) – *Calyptorhynchus baudinii* Lear, 1832 and *Calyptorhynchus latirostris* Carnaby, 1948 (Aves, CACATUIDA): usage of specific name conserved by designation of a neotype

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

*c/o Lee Kong Chian Natural History Museum, 2 Conservatory Drive,
Singapore 117377, Republic of Singapore (e-mail: iczn@nus.edu.sg)*

<http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:646322E7-CCE9-4D3B-8DA4-08C0F0CFE8B2>

Abstract. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has used its plenary power to designate a neotype for *Calyptorhynchus baudinii* Lear, 1832, thereby conserving usage of the specific names *Calyptorhynchus baudinii* Lear, 1832 and *Calyptorhynchus latirostris* Carnaby, 1948, for two species of endemic Australian cockatoos. Both specific names are placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; CACATUIDA; *Calyptorhynchus baudinii*; Baudin's Cockatoo; *Calyptorhynchus latirostris*; Carnaby's Cockatoo; Australia.

Ruling

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has hereby:

- (1) used its plenary power to set aside all previous type fixations for *Calyptorhynchus baudinii* Lear, 1832 and to designate as the neotype specimen WAM A11524 lodged in the Western Australian Museum, Perth, Western Australia;
- (2) placed the specific name *baudinii* Lear, 1832, as published in the binomen *Calyptorhynchus baudinii* and as defined by the neotype WAM A11524 designated in (1) above, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
- (3) placed the specific name *latirostris* Carnaby, 1948, as published in the binomen *Calyptorhynchus latirostris* and as defined by holotype A6436 in the Western Australian Museum, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3658

An application to conserve the specific names of two endemic Australian cockatoos, *Calyptorhynchus baudinii* Lear, 1832 and *Calyptorhynchus latirostris* Carnaby, 1948, was received from Ronald E. Johnstone (*Department of Terrestrial Zoology, Western Australian Museum, Locked bag 49, Welshpool DC, Western Australia 6986, Australia*), Clemency Fisher (*World Museum, National Museums Liverpool, William Brown Street, Liverpool, L3 8EN, U.K.*) and Denis A. Saunders (*CSIRO Land & Water Sciences, GPO Box 1700, Canberra, ACT, 2601, Australia*). After correspondence the Case was published in BZN 71(3): 170–178 on 30 September 2014 (Johnstone et al., 2014). The title, abstract and keywords of the Case were published on the Commission's website. No comments on the Case were received.

The Case was sent for vote on 1 September 2016 (VP 3). A greater than two-thirds majority of Commissioners voted FOR the Case (24 For, 0 Against, 1 Abstain).

Decision of the Commission

At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2016 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 24: Aescht, Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchard, Dmitriev, Evenhuis, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Ng, Pape, Rheindt, Rosenberg, van Tol, Welter-Schultes, Winston, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative votes – none.

Abstain – 1: Alonso-Zarazaga.

No votes were received from Bourgoïn and Pyle.

Voting FOR, Kojima remarked that the one, and only, weakness of this proposal is that the figure in Johnstone et al. (2014, fig. 2) does not include the values for the holotype of *Calyptorhynchus latirostris*. Also, the figure referred to at the end of paragraph 4 in Johnstone et al. (2014, p. 176) should be “Fig. 2” and not “Fig. 7”. Also voting FOR, Ng noted that while he was fully in support of the application, it should be noted that the supposed Liverpool specimen is probably a lectotype, and not a holotype, as no one really knows how many specimens Lear had. The question would then be whether this is the same specimen as the one in the painting, which is a possibility. Nevertheless, this is irrelevant. Furthermore, as there are no other syntypes on hand and the de facto lectotype is extant, the nomenclatural problem needs to be resolved. Under these circumstances, the designation of a neotype is the right course of action. Also voting FOR, Winston commented that the research behind the application was a job well done, with nice detective work and follow-through to avoid a nomenclatural mess.

Choosing to ABSTAIN, Alonso-Zarazaga stated that this application (and others like it that have come to his attention) has made him wonder if the duties as a community of zoologists (and Commissioners) were being carried out as well as possible. What would the goal of preserving types be if, when they are found to not correspond to current (and possibly erroneous) concepts, they can be set aside and neotypes created, thereby maintaining the results of a job badly done for generations, rather than synonymising a name that is apparently of concern to some people. Two disturbing rationales are thus being propagated: 1) that there is no need for keeping reference collections and types in a museum, since the concept in the literature is more important than the type specimen(s) which the concept should be mirroring – but which it is not, and with just a few years of erroneous “prevailing usage”, disinterest in the original type material, and new neotypes meeting the wrong new concept (perhaps following the same fate as its predecessor in the coming years!); consequently, museums and zoological collections can be disposed of, since buildings, staff, etc. are expensive, concepts cost less to store; 2) the type specimens’ patrimony of any collection can be depleted and transferred to another institution (a sudden gift!), the original institution being deprived of any possibility of protesting. The first rationale is dangerous for Zoology as a science, the second is unethical. A revision of the ethical aspects of the Code is thus urgently needed, in his opinion, and neotypes should be created only when the original type material is lost or lacks diagnostic characters, rather than for not meeting current concepts. Precisely because of these reasons, he opted to abstain.

Original descriptions

The following are the original descriptions to the entries on either an Official List or an Index in the ruling given in the present Opinion:

baudinii, *Calyptorhynchus*, Lear, 1832: unnumbered plate.

latirostris, *Calyptorhynchus*, Carnaby, 1948: 137.

References

Carnaby, I.C. 1948. Variations in the White-tailed Black Cockatoo. *The Western Australian Naturalist*, **1**: 136–138.

Johnstone, R.E., Fisher, C. & Saunders, D.A. 2014. Case 3658. *Calyptorhynchus baudinii* Lear, 1832 (Aves, Cacatuidae): proposed conservation of usage by designation of a neotype. *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, **71**(3): 170–178.

Lear, E. 1832. *Illustrations of the family of the Psittacidae, or parrots*. Pt XII.E. Lear, London.